DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 144 EA 027 251

AUTHOR Giles, Corrie
TITLE The Training of School Principals: Emerging Themes in England and Wales.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Free Enterprise System; Leadership Training; *Management Development; *Principals; *Professional Development; *School Based Management
IDENTIFIERS *England; *Wales

ABSTRACT

Professional development of senior staff in English and Welsh schools has traditionally involved universities and local education authorities (LEAs). This paper reviews the development of education-management courses--the client-professional relationship, the customer-provider relationship (or market-forces model), and the partnership relationship. It is argued that school-based management (SBM) can have the following unexpected consequences on educational management: lack of coherence, an emphasis on management training rather than on management development, and less effective use of delegated training resources. The paper describes two initiatives that indicate a shift away from market-force policies and examines changes to the 1995-96 Grants for Educational Support and Training (GEST) Program. The Headteachers' Leadership and Management Program (HEADLAMP) voucher initiative, which is administered through the Teacher Training Agency, is also described. The combination of intervention; delegated decision making at the school level; and fresh initiatives from providers in higher education, LEAs, and the private sector should help to create a positive dynamic tension that extends to the preparation of aspiring and new principals. One table is included. (Contains 14 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 144

CORRIE GILES

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION CONSULTANT

ROUND TABLE PAPER PRESENTED TO

THE AERA ANNUAL CONFERENCE 1995

IN SAN FRANCISCO

TITLE OF PAPER:

The Training of School Principals: Emerging Themes in England and Wales.

AUTHOR:

CORRIE GILES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mr. Corrie Giles,
Education Management and Administration Consultant,
91, Main Street South,
PO Box 8000,
Waterdown,
Ontario,
CANADA,
LOR 2HO.

Telephone (905) 689-9248.
FAX (905) 689-9483.

"e" mail colgiles@netaccess.on.ca

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Giles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 027 251

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Training of School Principals: Emerging Themes In England and Wales.

A Brief History

Professional development of senior staff in schools in England and Wales has traditionally involved universities and local education authorities (LEAs). Despite the arrival of specialist university programmes devoted to the management of education in the 1970's, and systemic reform radically altering the professional context from which the next generation of principals will emerge, the provision of suitable programs to prepare teachers for senior positions in schools has continued to be professionally ***ad hoc***. To a large extent, the quality of, access to, and utility of programmes has also continued to vary by region, depending very much upon the nature of the courses offered by local universities; the commitment of individual LEAs to supporting management development, and the availability of resources to fund the release of staff to attend.

In reviewing the development of education management courses in universities in England and Wales in the past twenty years, Watson (1993, p.4-5) provides a useful insight into the nature of much of the management development provision available to senior staff wishing to become school principals:

Model One: *The Client/Professional Relationship*, which dominated the development of senior managers in schools in the 1970's and early 1980's. Course participants were viewed as passive recipients of the profound knowledge held in the university, with little voice in course design, content, or identification of their own personal development needs.

Model Two: *The 'Customer/Provider' Relationship*, which emerged as a dominant model in some universities in the late 1980's, and in which the student is now the customer. The university provides services paid for from the school budget, delegated to individual schools under the site-based management arrangements that have operated in England and Wales since the 1988 Education Reform Act.

The predominant assumption in this 'market forces model' is that individual teachers and schools know what training will best serve their purposes, and that teachers' have a commitment to their own continuing professional development. In addition, the model assumes that the relevance of programmes, the quality of provision and value for money would all improve if the profession was free to ***choose*** what provision to buy in an open market.

Indeed, additional funds were provided by central government and delegated to schools for management development by means of the LEA administered Grants for Educational Support and Training (GEST). This programme is reviewed annually and closely linked to national training priorities, with management training at all levels continuing to be recognised in the GEST programme as a key element in ensuring the successful implementation of government's educational reforms.

Model Two also reflected a growing awareness in higher education that, now schools had charge of their own staff development budgets, universities needed to be seen to be answering the criticisms of management courses provided for schools in England and Wales, and so succinctly summarised in the 1990 School Management Task Force Report "Developing School Management - The Way Forward" (HMSO, 1990) and outlined in Table One.

TABLE ONE

TRAINING PROVISION - CHANGING EMPHASIS

CURRENT EMPHASIS	REDIRECTED EMPHASIS
TUTOR-DIRECTED COURSES.	SUPPORT FOR SELF-DIRECTED STUDY BY INDIVIDUALS, SCHOOL TEAMS, PEER GROUPS.
OFF-SITE TRAINING.	IN-SCHOOL AND NEAR-TO-SCHOOL TRAINING.
PREDETERMINED TIMES.	FLEXITIME STUDY.
ORAL PRESENTATIONS.	DISTANCE-LEARNING MATERIALS, INFORMATION PACKS AND PROJECTS.
PROVIDER-DETERMINED SYLLABUS.	SCHOOL-DETERMINED AGENDA.
KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION.	PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT.

Source: School Management Task Force, 1990.

Model Three: *The 'Partnership' Relationship*

Model Three was of a number of imaginative partnership developments to emerge in response to the Task Force Report, both in terms of improving the quality and relevance of existing provision, and responding to the new realities of an educational market place.

Partnerships were developed between different elements of the education system, to provide a range of services best suited to targeting scarce resources to the needs of various client groups (for examples see Bell and Day, 1991; Oldroyd, 1993; Saunders and Harris, 1993; Giles, 1993 and Giles, 1995).

No one partner had higher status and discussions between partners, although frank and business-like, centred upon the concepts of identified need and the application of theory to practice.

The Unexpected Consequences of Site-based Management

Two of the ***assumptions*** driving the market forces approach had a number of unexpected consequences for in-service provision:

(1) The assumption that competition enhances the choice of training and improves quality:

Schools are now very much the customers of the few central services retained by LEAs, and staff development survives in many LEAs on an agency basis. As with the university sector, schools choose whether or not to buy back into the various packages offered by the LEA, and that may well not include a wide range of management training due to the limited number of teachers wishing to enter senior management positions.

With the requirement that LEAs delegate the majority of their centrally-delegated funds to schools, it is also difficult under the LMS initiative for LEAs to retain their advice and support function, to maintain their teachers centres as a base for management training, or to continue to support the payment of fees for access to higher degrees.

As a result of putting LEAs and schools into a ***commercial*** rather than ***professional relationship***, too many LEA management development programmes tend to be limited in scope, closely aligned to the latest government initiative and to have a ***management training*** rather than ***management development*** focus. As a result, market forces have led to programmes which are frequently characterised by a lack of coherence and suspect professional delivery, and which demonstrate little conceptual understanding of the complex concepts necessary for successful management learning.

(2) The assumption that delegated training resources are used more effectively:

This assumption has proved to be fundamentally flawed, even when resources have been delegated to schools under a budget heading 'earmarked' for management development. Delegation assumes that decision makers are in a position to make ***informed choices*** about

individual and organisational development needs at a time when schools are overwhelmed with change.

It is also difficult for schools to invest in the future when annual budget cuts are forcing schools to increase class sizes and shed staff. One area where savings can be made is in the staff development budget. Creative accountancy and a liberal interpretation of what can be allowed as management training within GEST grants (computers purchased for the use of managers being a typical example) has seen much of the staff development budget diverted to other priorities.

Even if management development resources have not been diverted elsewhere, persistent underfunding of schools leaves an average of $150 US per teacher per year in a high school, and about $100 US in the primary sector. Supply cover costs are an additional $100 US per teacher per day. In reality this makes it difficult to implement a management development policy without aggregating funds and then allocating them to a limited number of individuals, even if they wish to be the principals of the future, which the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) have reported that schools are reluctant to do (see Levacic and Glover, 1995, p. 10).

Evidence of Growing Concern

Although Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools (HMCI) points to 1993/94 as a turning point in the drive for improved standards which has underpinned government reform of the education service, there has been persistent criticism in his reports of the standard of management in many schools. In his 1993/94 Report HMCI commented that:

> "It is...the leadership provided by the headteacher which is the critical factor in improving the quality of teaching in todays's schools".

Similar views were expressed in the 1994 "Report of the School Teachers Review Body" (STRB; 1994) which was highly critical of the standards of management in many schools. This criticism has continued this year:

> "Improving the effectiveness of school management remains one of our fundamental concerns. The scope for improvement is illustrated by the assessment made by the Chief Inspector that the proportion of teaching which is less than satisfactory ranges from about 30 per cent for pupils aged 7 to 11 to about 15 per cent for post-16 pupils" (STRB, 1995).

A Glimpse of the Future?

Significantly, two initiatives relating to management development in schools were announced in July 1994 by a new Secretary of State for Education (a former teacher) who reportedly agrees that unbridled market forces do not necessarily answer every single question (TES, 20/1/95, p. 15). The two initiatives include:

* The introduction in Circular 18/94 of a GEST school effectiveness block grant with a strong emphasis upon management development tied into individual school development plans.

* The introduction by the newly formed Teacher Training Agency of a management training programme for newly appointed principals, known as the Headteachers' Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP), to be operational from April 1995.

Both initiatives indicate a marked shift away from allowing market forces attitudes concerning management development, towards policies which reveal a deep-seated concern for the lack of management development taking place within the system as a whole.

Changes to the 1995/96 GEST Programme (DFE Circular 18/94)

The 1995/96 Grants for Educational Support and Training (see DFE Circular 18/94) has brought together a variety of individual grant programmes as a new block grant to be used for ***school effectiveness*** There are three key areas to be supported within the school effectiveness grant:

* management (through the training of governors, principals and other staff);
* support for the basic curriculum and assessment, and
* information technology.

The key change in relation to previous years is the tying of grants to improving effectiveness in line with the school development plan (SDP), with schools having to provide their SDP to their LEA by the 31st March 1995 in advance of GEST bid applications.

The strong emphasis in Circular 18/94 upon accountable management development and the emergence from laissez faire is encouraging, in particular:

* the early training and induction of staff newly appointed to management posts.
* training designed to prepare vice-principals for

principalship.
* training in assessing and meeting staff training and development needs.

Headteachers' Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP)

The role of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), a new government quango ostensibly established to oversee policy and the funding of initial teacher training, has already expanded to include the in-service preparation of senior staff. The TTA consultative document (TTA, 4th November 1994) announced a scheme for targeting resources for the training of newly appointed headteachers (principals) in management.

The new HEADLAMP *voucher initiative* has been in addition to the long-standing support for principal mentoring included in previous GEST funding rounds. The voucher of $5500 CAN may be applied for by governing bodies appointing a new principal, and must be spent within two years of initial appointment. The voucher may only be used with *an approved provider* on the list maintained centrally by the Teachers Training Agency. To be approved, the provider must submit:

* A brief history of their involvement in management training, indicating what training, if any, they have provided for principals in the past.
* Brief details of the training they offer and/or intend to offer which meets the HEADLAMP criteria.
* Details of any accreditation and/or validation arrangements that apply to that provision.
* Details of the internal mechanisms they have in place to assess the quality of their training.

In addition, the programmes developed by providers should:

* Be designed to develop at least one element within the principal competencies (from a list supplied by the TTA).

* Relate that competency element or elements to at least one group of the identified principal management tasks (from a list supplied by the TTA).

* Be clear about the previous management experience required of participants to benefit from the training, and the type of principalship for which the training is designed (in terms of phase, size and age range of school).

* Help participants to identify their personal management development priorities and respond flexibly to those needs.

* Reflect high quality expertise in leadership and management *from within and outside the education service.*

The TTA intends that, in addition to possible inspection by OFSTED, all training received by newly appointed principals will be rigorously evaluated.

The TTA also recommends that the HEADLAMP competencies framework be used by governing bodies in the initial selection process for a new principals; that the framework provide a basis for identifying training needs upon appointment and in drafting and agreeing a personal development plan (PDP), and that the PDP be reviewed at the initial meeting in the head's statutory appraisal cycle and subsequently incorporated into the targets for action agreed at the appraisal interview. The head's PDP should also reflect the needs of the school development plan.

Towards a National Framework?

These recent announcements (the HEADLAMP programme in particular) are a significant recognition of the concerns expressed by HMCI and the STRB, and a tacit recognition of the damage that unbridled market forces were doing to professional development in a period of on-going fiscal restraint. In the latest "Annual Report" by the Chief Inspector of schools he states an intention to investigate whether conditions for improvement, in particular, the exercise of ***curricular as well as professional leadership*** by principals, and the availability of curriculum support and in-service training are as favourable as they can be.

In a plethora of consultation documents, quite uncharacteristic of government in the latter part of the previous decade, the TTA has, somewhat significantly, included a document seeking views on their possible role in the continuing professional development.

Hopefully the TTA initiative will contribute to the planning of a coherent national framework of in-service training, and management development has returned from the wilderness of market forces. The combination of intervention, delegated decision making at school level, and fresh initiatives from providers in higher education, LEAs and the private sector should help to create a positive ***dynamic tension*** which extends to the preparation of aspiring as well as newly-appointed principals. Certainly we are beginning to see a more positive future for in-service training signalled by these developments, in a service which was in danger of extinction as a result of the ill-thought-out government policies of very recent years.

...ooOoo...

Bibliography

Bell, L. and Day, C. (1991), Managing the Professional Development of Teachers. Milton Keynes: Open University.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1990) Developing School Management - The Way Forward. London: HMSO.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (1994) 1995/96 Grants for Educational Support and Training. Circular 18/94, London: HMSO.

Giles, C. (1993, September) School-based Management Development: Partnership in Action. Paper presented at the "Partnerships in Education: Successes and Stresses" conference of the British Education Management and Administration Society, Moray House Institute of Education, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh. ERIC EDU 367062.

Giles, C. (1995) "Training the Future: A Programme for School Leaders". Management in Education, Vol. 9 (1, February), pp. 30-31.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (1988) Education Reform Act 1988. London: HMSO.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (1994) School Teachers' Review Body Third Report 1994. London: HMSO.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (1995) School Teachers' Review Body Third Report. London: HMSO.

Levacic, R. and Glover, D. (1995) "Trying to Keep to the Official Line". Times Educational Supplement. January 6th, p.10.

Lyons, G., Jirasinghe, D., Ewers, C. and Edwards, S. (1993) "The Development of a Headteachers' Assessment Centre". Educational Management and Administration, Vol. 21, (4), pp. 245-248.

OFFICE FOR STANDARDS IN EDUCATION (1995) The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools: Standards and Quality in Education 1993/94. London: HMSO.

Oldroyd, D., (1993) "Distance Action Learning: Does it Improve Performance?". Management in Education. Vol. 7, (No. 2, Summer), pp. 7-8.

Saunders, N. and Harris, D. (1993) "Ahead in Partnership". Management in Education, Vol. 7 (2, Summer), pp. 14-15.

Watson, L. (1993) "The Changing Role of Higher Education in Developing School Managers". Management in Education, Vol. 7 (2, Summer), pp. 3-6.